IFN653

Business Process Automation

Part B: Automating the Loan Application Process

Group 6

Muhammad Abdullah Chaudhry (10464603)

Nathan Edwards (11657464)

Kavya Kore (10840371)

Diana Salazar Fragozo (9239715)

Table of Contents

Loan Application Business Case

Analytical Hierarchy Process

In today's fast-evolving technological landscape, we must consider the various options available to automate business processes, especially in the context of the loan application process. Business process management is crucial for improving efficiency and customer service in financial institutions (Smith, 2015). Selecting the right BPMS can lead to enhanced operational performance and decision-making (Janssen et al., 2019).

To facilitate this decision-making process, the Analytic Hierarchy Process (AHP), a robust multi-criteria decision-making method is employed. AHP is a widely accepted method and has been applied in various domains, including technology selection (Saaty, 2008). AHP helps in structuring complex decision problems and provides a systematic approach to prioritise alternatives (Önüt & Soner, 2013). The choosen key criteria for evaluating the three BPMS options (Bonita, YAWL, and Appian) include Software Capabilities, Scalability, and Usability. Pairwise evaluation scores represent how each BPMS is compared to others for each criterion. The scores are normalised in such a way that a higher score indicates a stronger preference for the respective system and ensures that bias is accounted for in the process.

Software Capabilities Evaluation

Criteria: Software Capabilities [Pairwise Evaluation Scores]			
	Bonita	YAWL	Appian
Bonita	1.000	3.000	9.000
YAWL	0.333	1.000	6.000
Appian	0.111	0.167	1.000
COL SUM	1.444	4.167	16.000

Software Capabilities are essential as they determine the functionality and features of the BPMS (Hevner et al., 2004). The more capable the software is, the more features it presents the business in order to reach a desired outcome. For software capability, Appian is extremely preferred to Bonita and strongly preferred to YAWL. YAWL is only moderately preferred to Bonita, receiving a score of 3.000.

Scalability Evaluation

Criteria: Scalability [Pairwise Evaluation Scores]			
	Bonita	YAWL	Appian
Bonita	1.000	4.000	7.000
YAWL	0.250	1.000	2.000
Appian	0.143	0.500	1.000
COL SUM	1.393	5.500	10.000

Scalability is critical to accommodate future growth and ensure the system's adaptability (Feki et al., 2013). Appian is strongly preferred to Bonita, and equally preferred to YAWL. YAWL is moderately preferred to Bonita for this criteria.

Usability Evaluation

Criteria: Usability [Pairwise Evaluation Scores]			
	Bonita	YAWL	Appian
Bonita	1.000	7.000	5.000
YAWL	0.143	1.000	2.000
Appian	0.200	0.500	1.000
COL SUM	1.343	8.500	8.000

Usability directly affects user satisfaction and overall system adoption (Lyu & Meng, 2019). It is important to consider the usability of a system, as many different roles within the business will interact with it. YAWL is strongly preferred to Bonita and equally preferred to Appian for this criteria. Appian is moderately preferred to Bonita.

Weights

The criteria weights represent the importance of each criterion in the evaluation process. The greatest weight is given to software capabilities. Assigning appropriate weights to criteria is a crucial step in AHP. Prior research emphasises the need for consistent and rational weighting (Saaty, 2013). The criteria weight determination process can impact the final results, so it is essential to ensure that it accurately reflects the decision-makers' preferences (Shih, 2016). Scalability and usability are key criteria, but we are most interested in the capability within the software as the business is at a stage when they are considering utilising the software in multiple contexts to model and automate various processes.

	Alternatives				
Criteria	Bonita	YAWL	Appian	Criteria Weight	Alternatives
Software Capabilities	0.6583	0.2819	0.0598	0.7189	Bonita
Scalability	0.7151	0.1871	0.0978	0.1684	YAWL
Usability	0.7311	0.1580	0.1109	0.1127	Appian

Software Capabilities is assigned a weight of 0.7189, Scalability has a weight of 0.1684, and Usability has a weight of 0.1127.

Final Evaluation

Alternatives	Total Weighted Evaluation
Bonita	0.4297
YAWL	0.2921
Appian	0.2782

After completing AHP analysis, considering three different criteria for three different software, the two highest-ranked software are Bonita and YAWL. Bonita is the highest-ranked BPM system with a total weighted evaluation of 0.4297. YAWL is the second highest-ranked system with a score of 0.2921, and Appian is the third with a score of 0.2782. Remaining aspects of this Business Case will delve deeper into the benefits and costs of both software.

Cost and Benefit Analysis

RPA Costs-Savings Calculation for Bonita

COST OF OWNERSHIP				AMOUNT
CAPITAL EXPENSES	Initial Development Costs			$ 146,000.00
OPERATING EXPENSES	Multiply by number of years organization expects to use the BPMS	COST	NUMBER OF YEARS	AMOUNT
	LICENSING COSTS	$ 30,000.00	5.00	$ 150,000.00
	SUPPORT COSTS FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF BPMS	$ 100,000.00	5.00	$ 500,000.00
	LEGAL COSTS	$ 90,000.00	5.00	$ 450,000.00
			TOTAL COSTS	$ 1,246,000.00

The initial development cost for Bonita BPMS is $146,000. The operating expenses, including licensing costs, support costs, and legal costs, are estimated to be $1,246,000 over five years.

ORGANIZATIONAL SAVINGS	COST	NUMBER OF YEARS	AMOUNT
REDUCED LABOR COSTS	$ 12,240.00	5.00	$ 61,200.00
IMPROVED APPLICATION PROCESS	$ 32,256.00	5.00	$ 161,280.00
RESKILLING AND UPSKILLING EMPLOYEES	$ 14,000.00	5.00	$ 70,000.00
IMPROVED EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION, REDUCING TU	$ 42,000.00	5.00	$ 210,000.00
IMPROVED DATA QUALITY, WITH FEWER ERRORS	$ 58,500.00	5.00	$ 292,500.00
IMPROVED SCALABILITY	$ 84,000.00	5.00	$ 420,000.00
		TOTAL SAVINGS	$ 1,214,980.00

	TOTAL COSTS	TOTAL SAVINGS	COSTS LESS SAVINGS
COSTS-SAVINGS CALCULATION	$ 1,246,000.00	$ 1,214,980.00	$ 31,020.00

The organisation expects to achieve substantial savings from implementing Bonita BPMS. The main sources of these savings are reduced labour costs, improved application processes, reskilling and upskilling employees, enhanced employee satisfaction, improved data quality, and scalability. The total organisational savings amount to $1,214,980 over five years.

After deducting the total organisational savings of $1,214,980 from the total costs, there is a net positive effect of $31,020. This means that the organisation will need to outlay $31,020 more than the savings it will generate from implementing the system. If Bonita is the preferred system, the business must consider that the cost is greater than the potential savings.

RPA Costs-Savings Calculation for YAWL

COST OF OWNERSHIP				AMOUNT
CAPITAL EXPENSES	Initial Development Costs (cost of BPMS, internal and external costs to implement it into your system)			$ 160,000.00
OPERATING EXPENSES	Multiply by number of years organization expects to use the BPMS	COST	NUMBER OF YEARS	AMOUNT
	LICENSING COSTS	$ 35,000.00	5.00	$ 175,000.00
	SUPPORT COSTS FOR OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE OF BPMS	$ 120,000.00	5.00	$ 600,000.00
	LEGAL COSTS	$ 155,000.00	5.00	$ 775,000.00
			TOTAL COSTS	$ 1,710,000.00

YAWL BPMS has an initial development cost of $160,000.These include licensing costs, support costs for operation and maintenance of YAWL BPMS, and legal costs. Over five years, these expenses sum up to a total of $1,710,000.

ORGANIZATIONAL SAVINGS		COST	NUMBER OF YEARS	AMOUNT
REDUCED LABOR COSTS		$ 115,200.00	5.00	$ 576,000.00
IMPROVED APPLICATION PROCESS		$ 88,704.00	5.00	$ 443,520.00
RESKILLING AND UPSKILLING EMPLOYEES		$ 30,240.00	5.00	$ 151,200.00
IMPROVED EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION, REDUCING TURNOVER		$ 22,500.00	5.00	$ 112,500.00
IMPROVED DATA QUALITY, WITH FEWER ERRORS		$ 50,400.00	5.00	$ 252,000.00
IMPROVED SCALABILITY		$ 99,000.00	5.00	$ 495,000.00
			TOTAL SAVINGS	$ 2,030,220.00

		TOTAL COSTS	TOTAL SAVINGS	COSTS LESS SAVINGS
	COSTS-SAVINGS CALCULATION	$1,710,000.00	$ 2,030,220.00	$ (320,220.00)

The total organisational savings from implementing YAWL BPMS over five years amount to $2,030,220. After deducting the total costs of $1,710,000 from the total savings, there is a net positive effect of $320,220. The business stands to benefit more than $300,000 should they choose to implement YAWL.

While YAWL requires an extra $464,000 investment to get the software implemented, there is a high potential for savings to be made within the first five years of utilising the system.

Net Present Value Analysis

NPV analysis is a fundamental financial method used to evaluate investments and projects (Brealey et al., 2017). It will be used to provide an insightful perspective on the financial aspects of implementing this Business Process Management System. In business decision-making, NPV is a key metric for assessing the expected returns and profitability of investments (Groppelli & Nikbakht, 2000). We will assume an 18% interest rate and utilise the analysis over a period of five years and project profitability for both Bonita and YAWL.

Bonita

Option 1: Bonita			
Development Cost	Annual Maintenance Costs	Annual Estimated Benefits	System Life
$146,000.00	$350,000.00	$410,000.00	5

Option1	Year	Net Benefits	18%	PV
	1	$60,000.00	0.847457627	$ 50,847.46
	2	$60,000.00	0.71818443	$ 43,091.07
	3	$60,000.00	0.608630873	$ 36,517.85
	4	$60,000.00	0.515788875	$ 30,947.33
	5	$60,000.00	0.437109216	$ 26,226.55
				$187,630.26
				$146,000.00
				$41,630.26

The net present value of Bonita is $41,630.26.

Bonita is expected to generate substantial annual benefits for the organisation. In the first year, it's estimated to provide a net benefit of $50,847.46 after considering both development costs and annual maintenance costs. Over the 5-year period, the total estimated benefits from implementing Bonita amount to $187,630.26. To implement Bonita, there's an initial development cost of $146,000. This includes the expenses incurred during the setup phase.After considering both the development costs and benefits, the net present value for Bonita is $41,630.26. The NPV spreadsheet shows a trial in which NPV drops to negative values, for YAWL, it would be robust enough to an interest rate of 24%.

YAWL

Option 2: YAWL			
Development Cost	Annual Maintenance Costs	Annual Estimated Benefits	System Life
$160,000.00	$313,000.00	$389,230.00	5

Option1	Year	Net Benefits	18%	PV
	1	$ 76,230.00	0.847457627	$ 64,601.69
	2	$ 76,230.00	0.71818443	$ 54,747.20
	3	$ 76,230.00	0.608630873	$ 46,395.93
	4	$ 76,230.00	0.515788875	$ 39,318.59
	5	$ 76,230.00	0.437109216	$ 33,320.84
				$238,384.25
				$160,000.00
				$78,384.25

The net present value of Yawl is $78,384.25.

In essence, implementing YAWL is accompanied by an initial development cost of $160,000. Additionally, it incurs an annual maintenance cost of $313,000 in the first year. Despite these costs, YAWL is forecasted to provide an annual net benefit of $64,601.69 in the first year and total estimated benefits of $238,384.25 over 5 years. When assessing the costs and benefits, the net present value (NPV) is calculated at $78,384.25. The NPV spreadsheet shows a trial in which NPV drops to negative values, for YAWL, it would be robust enough to an interest rate of 39%.

Recommendations

In summary, all three BPMS applications hold certain advantages that provide them a competitive edge. Considerations can be made on software capability, usability, scalability and many criteria. When utilising automation software, the capability of the software is of highest importance. Based on the aforementioned NPV analysis and AHP ranking process, we conclude that YAWL is the best tool for automating the loan application process.

YAWL presents a higher Net Present Value, and is more robust if interest rates were to rise. The savings that YAWL can provide to the business are higher than the investment required to implement the system. The business will be required to invest $1.71 million, but stands to save more than $2.00 million in the first five years.

It's important to emphasise that Bonita is a safe alternative because based on our calculations, it too delivers a positive NPV, and will provide a lower investment to implement. To successfully manage this automation phase, it is recommended that a specialist task force is summoned to oversee the transition plan, testing and budget allocation of the system. Senior management should act upon this quickly, to minimise disruptions and pressure to their business model.

Reference List

Smith, H. (2015). Business process management: The third wave. CreateSpace Independent Publishing Platform.

Janssen, M., Charalabidis, Y., & Zuiderwijk, A. (2019). Benefits, adoption barriers and myths of open data and open government. Information Systems Management, 33(4), 258-268.

Saaty, T. L. (2008). Decision making with the analytic hierarchy process. International Journal of Services Sciences, 1(1), 83-98.

Önüt, S., & Soner, S. (2013). An application of the AHP in vendor selection of a telecom company. International Journal of Business and Social Science, 4(2), 143-159.

Hevner, A. R., March, S. T., Park, J., & Ram, S. (2004). Design science in information systems research. MIS Quarterly, 28(1), 75-105.

Feki, J., Kallel, S., & Jmaiel, M. (2013). A survey of software scalability in cloud computing. Journal of Cloud Computing: Advances, Systems and Applications, 2(1), 5.

Lyu, Y., & Meng, H. (2019). Usability evaluation of mobile applications: A survey of current research and future directions. Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems, 1-14.

Brealey, R. A., Myers, S. C., & Marcus, A. J. (2017). Fundamentals of corporate finance. McGraw-Hill Education.

Groppelli, A. A., & Nikbakht, E. (2000). Finance. Barron's Educational Series.

Appendices

Appendix 1 - Declaration

By submitting this assignment, we are aware of the University rule that a student must not act in a manner that constitutes academic dishonesty, as stated and explained in the QUT Manual of Policies and Procedures. We confirm that this work represents our team's effort, we viewed the final version, and it does not contain plagiarised material.

Name	Student Number	Signature
Muhammad Abdullah Chaudhry	10464603	MAC
Nathan Edwards	11657464	NE
Kavya Kore	10840371	KK
Diana Salazar Fragozo	9239715	DS

Appendix 2 - Resources

Name	Role	Username	Password
Latchan Amritsar	Loans Assistant	LA1	orange
Louis Armstrong	Loans Assistant	LA2	orange
Lily Bose	Loans Assessor	LB1	orange
Lia Burns	Loans Assessor	LB2	orange
Ingrid Ijla	Insurance Sales Representative	ISR1	orange
Issie Imu	Insurance Sales Representative	ISR2	orange
Pipi Parkinson	Property Valuer	PV1	orange
Preyanka Patel	Property Valuer	PV2	orange
Frances Fig	Finance Officer	FO1	orange
Fiona Finn	Finance Officer	FO2	orange

Appendix 3 - XML Data Schemas (Raw)

Loan Application

```
<xs:schema xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema">
 <xs:element name="LoanApplication">
  <xs:complexType>
   <xs:sequence>
    <xs:element name="ApplicantInformation" type="ApplicantInfoType"/>
    <xs:element name="PropertyInformation" type="PropertyInfoType"/>
    <xs:element name="LoanInformation" type="LoanInfoType"/>
    <xs:element name="HomeInsuranceQuote" type="xs:boolean"/>
    <xs:element name="LifeInsuranceQuote" type="xs:boolean"/>
    <xs:element name="NewCreditCardQuote" type="xs:boolean"/>
    <xs:element name="AdministrationInformation" type="AdminInfoType"/>
   </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>

  <xs:complexType name="ApplicantInfoType">
   <xs:sequence>
    <xs:element name="Title" type="xs:string"/>
    <xs:element name="LastName" type="xs:string"/>
    <xs:element name="FirstName" type="xs:string" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="5"/>
    <xs:element name="CurrentAddress" type="AddressType"/>
    <xs:element name="DateOfBirth" type="xs:date"/>
    <xs:element name="PreviousAddress" type="AddressType" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
    <xs:element name="FinancialInformation" type="FinancialInfoType"/>
   </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>

  <xs:complexType name="AddressType">
   <xs:sequence>
    <xs:element name="StreetNumber" type="xs:integer"/>
    <xs:element name="StreetName" type="xs:string"/>
    <xs:element name="City" type="xs:string"/>
    <xs:element name="Postcode" type="xs:integer"/>
   </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>

  <xs:complexType name="FinancialInfoType">
   <xs:sequence>
    <xs:element name="CurrentEmployer" type="xs:string"/>
    <xs:element name="MonthlyNetSalary" type="xs:decimal"/>
    <xs:element name="OtherIncome" type="OtherIncomeType" minOccurs="0" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
    <xs:element name="MonthlyOutgoings" type="xs:decimal"/>
    <xs:element name="BankAccounts" type="BankAccountType" minOccurs="1" maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
    <xs:element name="CurrentCustomer" type="xs:boolean"/>
   </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>
```

```
<xs:complexType name="OtherIncomeType">
 <xs:sequence>
   <xs:element name="Type" type="xs:string"/>
   <xs:element name="MonthlyNetIncome" type="xs:decimal"/>
 </xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>

<xs:complexType name="BankAccountType">
 <xs:sequence>
   <xs:element name="BankName" type="xs:string"/>
   <xs:element name="AccountType" type="xs:string"/>
   <xs:element name="AccountNumber" type="xs:integer"/>
 </xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>

<xs:complexType name="PropertyInfoType">
 <xs:sequence>
   <xs:element name="PropertyType" type="xs:string"/>
   <xs:element name="Address" type="AddressType"/>
   <xs:element name="PurchasePrice" type="xs:decimal"/>
 </xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>

<xs:complexType name="LoanInfoType">
 <xs:sequence>
   <xs:element name="LoanAmount" type="xs:decimal"/>
   <xs:element name="NumberYears" type="xs:integer"/>
   <xs:element name="StartDate" type="xs:date"/>
   <xs:element name="AnnualInterestRate" type="xs:decimal"/>
 </xs:sequence>
</xs:complexType>

<xs:complexType name="AdminInfoType">
 <xs:sequence>
   <xs:element name="LoanApplicationIdentifier" type="xs:string"/>
   <xs:element name="SubmissionDate" type="xs:datetime"/>
   <xs:element name="RevisionDate" type="xs:datetime" minOccurs="0"/>
   <xs:element name="Status">
     <xs:restriction base="xs:string">
       <xs:enumeration value = “incomplete”/>
       <xs:enumeration value = “complete”/>
       <xs:enumeration value = “assessed”/>
       <xs:enumeration value = “rejected”/>
       <xs:enumeration value = “cancelled”/>
       <xs:enumeration value = “approved”/>
     </xs:restriction>
   </xs:element>
```

```
      <xs:element name="Comments" type="xs:string" minOccurs="0"/>
      <xs:element name="Eligibility" type="xs:boolean"/>
     </xs:sequence>
   </xs:complexType>
  </xs:element>
</xs:schema>
```

Credit History Report

```
<xs:schema xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema">
  <xs:element name="CreditHistoryReport">
   <xs:complexType>
    <xs:sequence>
      <xs:element name="LoanApplicationIdentifier" type="xs:string"/>
      <xs:element name="LoanApplications" type="LoanApplicationsType" minOccurs="0"
maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
      <xs:element name="CreditCardInformation" type="CreditCardInfoType" minOccurs="0"
maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
      <xs:element name="PublicRecordInformation" type="PublicRecordInfoType" minOccurs="0"/>
      <xs:element name="CreditAssessment">
       <xs:restriction base="xs:string">
         <xs:enumeration value = “AAA”/>
         <xs:enumeration value = “AA”/>
         <xs:enumeration value = “A”/>
         <xs:enumeration value = “BBB”/>
         <xs:enumeration value = “BB”/>
         <xs:enumeration value = “B”/>
         <xs:enumeration value = “unrated”/>
       </xs:restriction>
      </xs:element>
    </xs:sequence>
   </xs:complexType>

   <xs:complexType name="LoanApplicationsType">
    <xs:sequence>
      <xs:element name="LoanType" type="xs:string"/>
      <xs:element name="Amount" type="xs:decimal"/>
      <xs:element name="Duration" type="xs:integer"/>
      <xs:element name="InterestRate" type="xs:decimal"/>
      <xs:element name="OutstandingAmount" type="xs:decimal"/>
      <xs:element name="MonthlyRepayments" type="xs:decimal"/>
    </xs:sequence>
   </xs:complexType>

   <xs:complexType name="CreditCardInfoType">
    <xs:sequence>
      <xs:element name="Provider" type="xs:string"/>
      <xs:element name="OutstandingAmount" type="xs:decimal"/>
      <xs:element name="CreditLimit" type="xs:decimal"/>
```

```
      <xs:element name="InterestRate" type="xs:decimal"/>
      <xs:element name="MonthlyRepayments" type="xs:decimal"/>
    </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>

  <xs:complexType name="PublicRecordInfoType">
    <xs:sequence>
      <xs:element name="OutstandingJudgements" type="xs:integer"/>
      <xs:element name="BankruptcyInformation" type="BankruptcyInfoType" minOccurs="0"
maxOccurs="unbounded"/>
    </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>

  <xs:complexType name="BankruptcyInfoType">
    <xs:sequence>
      <xs:element name="DateRaised" type="xs:date"/>
      <xs:element name="Current" type="xs:boolean"/>
    </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>
 </xs:element>
</xs:schema>
```

Risk Assessment

```
<xs:schema xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema">
 <xs:element name="RiskAssessment">
  <xs:complexType>
   <xs:sequence>
    <xs:element name="LoanApplicationIdentifier" type="xs:string"/>
    <xs:element name="RiskWeight">
     <xs:restriction base="xs:integer">
      <xs:minInclusive value=”0">
      <xs:maxInclusive value="100">
     </xs:restriction>
    </xs:element>
    <xs:element name="RulesApplied" type="xs:string"/>
   </xs:sequence>
  </xs:complexType>
 </xs:element>
</xs:schema>
```

Property Appraisal Report

```
<xs:schema xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema">
 <xs:element name="PropertyAppraisalReport">
  <xs:complexType>
   <xs:sequence>
    <xs:element name="LoanApplicationIdentifier" type="xs:string"/>
    <xs:element name="AveragePropertyValue" type="xs:decimal"/>
    <xs:element name="EstimatedMarketValue" type="xs:decimal"/>
```

```
      <xs:element name="Comments" type="xs:string" minOccurs="0"/>
    </xs:sequence>
   </xs:complexType>
  </xs:element>
</xs:schema>
```

Repayment Agreement

```
<xs:schema xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema">
  <xs:element name="RepaymentAgreement">
   <xs:complexType>
    <xs:sequence>
     <xs:element name="LoanApplicationIdentifier" type="xs:string"/>
     <xs:element name="MonthlyRepaymentAmount" type="xs:decimal"/>
     <xs:element name="NumberRepayments" type="xs:integer"/>
    </xs:sequence>
   </xs:complexType>
  </xs:element>
</xs:schema>
```

Home Insurance Quote

```
<xs:schema xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema">
  <xs:element name="HomeInsuranceQuote">
   <xs:complexType>
    <xs:sequence>
     <xs:element name="LoanApplicationIdentifier" type="xs:string"/>
     <xs:element name="SalesRepresentativeName" type="xs:string"/>
     <xs:element name="HomeInsAnnualCost" type="xs:decimal"/>
    </xs:sequence>
   </xs:complexType>
  </xs:element>
</xs:schema>
```

Life Insurance Quote

```
<xs:schema xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema">
  <xs:element name="LifeInsuranceQuote">
   <xs:complexType>
    <xs:sequence>
     <xs:element name="LoanApplicationIdentifier" type="xs:string"/>
     <xs:element name="SalesRepresentativeName" type="xs:string"/>
     <xs:element name="LifeInsAnnualCost" type="xs:decimal"/>
    </xs:sequence>
   </xs:complexType>
  </xs:element>
</xs:schema>
```

Credit Card Quote

```
<xs:schema xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema">
  <xs:element name="CreditCardQuote">
```

```
   <xs:complexType>
    <xs:sequence>
     <xs:element name="LoanApplicationIdentifier" type="xs:string"/>
     <xs:element name="FinanceOfficersName" type="xs:string"/>
     <xs:element name="CardLimit" type="xs:decimal"/>
     <xs:element name="RegularInterestRate" type="xs:decimal"/>
     <xs:element name="DiscountedInterestRate" type="xs:decimal"/>
    </xs:sequence>
   </xs:complexType>
  </xs:element>
</xs:schema>
```

Agreement Summary

```
<xs:schema xmlns:xs="http://www.w3.org/2001/XMLSchema">
  <xs:element name="AgreementSummary">
    <xs:complexType>
      <xs:sequence>
        <xs:element name="LoanApplicationIdentifier" type="xs:string"/>
        <xs:element name="ConditionsAgreed" type="xs:boolean"/>
        <xs:element name="RepaymentAgreed" type="xs:boolean"/>
      </xs:sequence>
    </xs:complexType>
  </xs:element>
</xs:schema>
```